

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
December 6, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group on December 6, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Study Plan Relationships Diagram
Attachment 5	Study 1: Public and Private Vehicular Access
Attachment 6	Study 2: Recreation Safety Assessment
Attachment 7	Study 3: Assess Relationship of Project Operations and Recreation
Attachment 8	Study 4: Assess Relationship of Fish/Wildlife Management and Recreation
Attachment 9	Study 5: Assess Recreation Management Areas
Attachment 10	Study 6: ADA Accessibility Assessment
Attachment 11	Study 7: Reservoir Boating Survey
Attachment 12	Study 8: Carrying Capacity
Attachment 13	Study 9: Existing Recreation Use Study
Attachment 14	Study 10: Recreation Facility and Condition Inventory
Attachment 15	Study 11: Recreation and Public Use Impact Assessment
Attachment 16	Study 12: Projected Recreation Use
Attachment 17	Study 13: Recreation Surveys
Attachment 18	Study 14: Assess Regional Recreation and Barriers to Recreation
Attachment 19	Study 15: Recreation Suitability
Attachment 20	Study 16: Whitewater and River Boating
Attachment 21	Study 17: Recreation Needs Analysis
Attachment 22	Study 18: Recreation Activity, Spending, and Associated Economic Impacts
Attachment 23	Study 19: Fiscal Impacts

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – October 25, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the October 25, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #R36: Provide the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group with documentation of DWR's budget for Oroville recreation projects from the previous seven years.

- Status: Dave Ferguson indicated that the DWR recreation budget for Oroville is currently being reviewed and will be presented at the Plenary Group meeting on December 11, 2001. It will then be subsequently presented to Recreation and Socioeconomic Work Group at its next meeting scheduled for January 30, 2002.
- Action Item #R37:** Forward the Oroville Facilities Relicensing Interim Recreation Projects Recommendations to the Plenary Group with suggested revisions.
- Status: The Interim Recreation Projects list has been forwarded to the Plenary Group. The Plenary Group is expected to make a decision on the interim list by their January 2002 meeting. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group also requested that DWR develop an implementation plan within a month of DWR's decision on which interim projects to complete. The implementation plan is expected to be completed and sent to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group and the Plenary Group in February 2002 for information.
- Action Item #R32:** Discuss Issue Statement S2 with Mike Kelley, Butte County and JPA representatives to determine the fate of this Issue Statement.
- Status: Mr. Kelley made reference to a letter that DWR sent to the Thermalito Irrigation District. He was not satisfied with the response from DWR and he plans to pursue further action. Mr. Kelley indicated that by providing power at a reduced price, the City of Oroville could potentially attract industry and that the City already has the infrastructure in place, through the Thermalito Irrigation District, to accommodate the power. Butte County requested a copy of the DWR letter that Mike Kelley referenced; Mike Kelley offered to provide a copy of the letter to Butte County, as did DWR.

Study Plan Task Force Update

Doug Rischbieter (DWR) led the update on the Recreation and Socioeconomics Study Plan Task Force activities. With input from the Task Force, the Harza/EDAW consultant team has developed drafts of 19 different study plans. Due to time constraints, the draft study plans were not provided to the Work Group in advance of the meeting, however Doug explained that the study plans have all been reviewed at least once by the Task Force and are all currently in different stages of revision. The tentative plan is to provide all of the draft study plans to the Plenary Group at the next Plenary Group meeting on December 11, 2001. John Baas with the consulting team added that Task Force participants will notice some of the revisions suggested by the Task Force have not been incorporated due to time constraints but would be incorporated in the next versions. These suggested revisions have all been recorded in project notes and will be incorporated into the study plans; however, it is not guaranteed that these revisions would make it into the draft study plans before they go to the Plenary Group meeting on December 11.

Some work group participants expressed their concern about sending the study plans to the Plenary Group in draft form. It was explained that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group is not being asked to approve final study plans, but for the group's consensus to submit draft plans to the Plenary Group. Steve Nachtman reiterated that the study plans are currently working drafts and are going to the Plenary Group for a "top-down", conceptual review.

One participant inquired how the public would be involved in developing implementation plans (i.e., methodology) associated with the study plans. The Facilitator responded that the collaborative through task forces and work groups would continue to revise the study plans to include more detailed methodologies and that the public has been and is expected to remain actively involved in this effort. She also reminded participants that an important goal for the collaborative is to get research staff in the field by March 2002 for certain studies; efforts within all the Work Groups will be focused on adding implementation details to the identified critical path studies first.

The Facilitator explained what would be included in the study plan package presented to the Plenary Group. The package will include the study plans, abstracts of each study, a list of critical

path studies, and an issue-tracking document that combines information from Scoping Document I Appendix B and C intended to display the fate of each issue. Since the study plans are in various stages of development, the abstracts will indicate the status of each study plan.

There was concern that there would be insufficient time to review and revise the critical path study plans if March 2002 is the target date for fieldwork. The Facilitator acknowledged the short time frame and explained that critical path studies (those proposed for implementation in March 2002) have been identified for fast-track review from the Plenary Group and it is expected that the Work Groups would focus their short-term attention on these plans. A participant suggested that the study plans not be presented to the Plenary Group in December. Another suggested the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group provide only the abstracts to the Plenary Group. The Facilitator suggested that these draft plans would provide the Plenary Group a 'snapshot' of the study plans while the Work Groups continue to revise the plans as necessary. She explained how the Environmental Work Group is including a global status report covering all of their fisheries study plans that explains what remains to be completed on each plan. She suggested the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group might increase participants' comfort level by including a similar general statement indicating that the Work Group prior to submittal had not reviewed the Recreation and Socioeconomics Study Plans.

One participant expressed concerns about the unrealistic timeframe that the Work Group faces and requested more time before submitting the study plans. The participants discussed the pros and cons of submitting the study plans in December. One participant asked what action the Plenary Group would take on the study plans. The Facilitator responded that they would not take any action, only providing a general review of major issues.

Steve Nachtman indicated that Doug Rischbieter (DWR) will present the study plans to the Plenary Group and will have the opportunity to convey the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group's issues and concerns to the Plenary Group. This will be in addition to text in the introductory materials that go with the study plans.

The Facilitator reviewed the three options discussed: (1) do not send the study plans to the Plenary Group, (2) send the study plans to the Plenary Group with written and verbal explanations of their status, or (3) send only priority or critical path study plans to the Plenary Group. The consensus of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group was option 2.

One participant requested DWR staff double check that all 150 issues from Scoping Document 1 are covered in the study plans. The Facilitator responded that the status for all issues raised is currently being compiled and a draft 'tracking' document will be included with the Plenary Group study plan package.

Study Plan Review

John Baas distributed a conceptual framework (Attachment 4) illustrating the interrelationships between all of the study plans and how they interact to produce the Recreation Master Plan for the Project. The diagram groups the studies into the following categories: Inventories; Projected Recreation Demand; Opportunities and Constraints; Recreational Constraints; and Socioeconomics. All of the 19 studies would start in Year 1. Several of the studies would be continued into Year 2, incorporating the results from other Recreation/Socioeconomics study plans, as well as results from study plans developed in other Work Groups. In general, Year 1 studies are designed to meet FERC requirements and Year 2 studies focus on developing the Recreation Master Plan and evaluation of potential protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures.

John presented an overview of Study Plans R1 through R17; Tom Wegge, with the consulting team presented Study Plans R18 and R19. The overviews summarized the changes that were

made at the previous Task Force meetings. The following additional comments were noted during study plan review.

Study Plan 1 (Public and Private Vehicular Access)

Study Plan SP-R1 does not address trail access, only vehicular access. Trail issues will be addressed in SP-R9. Also, it will only cover roadways in the study area: other regional transportation links will be covered in SP-R14. One participant expressed concern about the Craig access road, due to its degraded condition. John Baas responded that the Craig access roadway segment would be evaluated in this study.

Another participant expressed concern about global omissions in the study area tables that are copied throughout the study plans, specifically the need to add the diversion pool area. Doug Rischbieter responded that these global changes would be made to the study plans.

Study Plan 2 (Recreation Safety Assessment)

This study plan was revised to include the appropriate agencies that will be considered and/or consulted for the purposes of the study. The distinction between wild land and forest fires was discussed and revisions made in the text.

Study Plan 3 (Assess Relationship of Project Operations and Recreation)

This study plan language was modified as it relates to recreational effects from project operations. It also was revised to show that the study will draw on information from Study Plans R7, R9, R13, and from studies conducted by the Engineering and Operations Work Group. Several tasks were split into sub-tasks.

Study Plan 4 (Assess Relationship of Fish/Wildlife Management and Recreation)

This study plan was revised to include all fish/wildlife management in the Project area, not just the Oroville Wildlife Area. It was also revised to show coordination with SP-R13.

Study Plan 5 (Assess Recreation Management Areas)

This study plan was revised to reflect the large amount of existing information pertaining to this issue. Local agency information sources were added to the Introduction. The participants discussed the need to seek outside funding sources to fund potential management actions identified in this study and decided that the identification of outside funding sources should be added to this study. Also, a range of management structures will be evaluated in this study. Some participants voiced concern that there may be too much reliance on past "flawed" studies. The consulting team promised that reports critical of past studies, such as ORAC notes and subcommittee reports, will also be reviewed.

Study Plan 6 (ADA Accessibility Assessment)

John Baas explained there is proposed legislation that may affect this study plan. Any pertinent legislative changes will be incorporated into the study plan, if necessary. It was discovered that other agencies are also completing similar studies; the consultant team will acquire this information. Doug Rischbieter (DWR) indicated that the Department of Parks and Recreation information related to LOSRA ADA issues has been developed to the same or greater degree as the DWR and DFG information presumed to be the basis for the study.

Study Plan 7 (Reservoir Boating Survey)

This study plan has been revised to include comments from the Dangermond Group.

Study Plan 8 (Carrying Capacity)

John indicated that the consulting team is currently acquiring information from a California State University professor that will be incorporated into this study plan. This study was characterized as

more technical in nature, relative to the other studies. One participant suggested that physical constraints (e.g., pipelines) should be evaluated under this study.

Study Plan 9 (Existing Recreation Use Study)

John indicated that no comments were received on this study in the previous Task Force meeting. This study was modified to augment the number of sampling days. The most current attendance data will be acquired from the Department of Parks and Recreation.

One participant inquired as to how coordination will be determined as specified in section 7 of the study plan. John responded that coordination would occur as outlined in the process flow diagram explained earlier in the meeting (see Attachment 4), as well as ongoing coordination with other Work Groups.

Concerns were raised regarding the technical quality and accuracy of the existing studies, information, and references listed in the study plan. One participant indicated that they had provided written comments on those existing studies and requested those comments, which are included in the ORAC meeting documentation, also be reviewed. Steve Nachtman indicated that the entire record pertaining to those studies, as well as all comments in the appendices to Scoping Document 1, would be reviewed and evaluated prior to initiation of this study.

Study Plan 10 (Recreation Facility and Condition Inventory)

This study plan includes detailed lists of facilities to be evaluated. The proposed facility inventory was included as an appendix to this study plan.

Study Plan 11 (Recreation and Public Use Impact Assessment)

This study reflects that recreational use has the potential to affect a wide-range of resources, such as soil/vegetation, cultural resources, etc. One participant indicated that a standardized set of criteria is needed to implement this study and participants agreed that these criteria should be discussed at a later date.

Study Plan 12 (Projected Recreation Use)

This study plan received several comments at the most recent Task Force meeting. This study will use interviews to identify trends and it will be more qualitative than quantitative. Pete Dangermond, representing the JPA, indicated that a supply-demand analysis is necessary. John Baas responded that supply/demand analysis is part of Study Plan R15. Pete suggested that the formula used to project recreational demand should be based on future, not existing, conditions.

Study Plan 13 (Recreation Surveys)

This study was described as mainly a data collection effort. There were changes made to the sampling schedule to be more reflective of actual conditions. Bi-lingual surveys may be necessary; pre-testing is currently being conducted to determine the necessity and if so, what languages are appropriate.

Study Plan 14 (Assess Regional Recreation and Barriers to Recreation)

This study plan was revised to include an initial review task and literature search to determine barriers prior to assessing their impact to recreation. It will involve an analysis of regional, as well as local, conditions.

Study Plan 15 (Recreation Suitability)

This study incorporates the concept of supply and demand for recreation. It identifies options for recreational opportunities at Lake Oroville and is largely a mapping task.

One participant suggested that this study plan evaluate the feasibility of clustering activities in certain geographic locations. John Baas noted the concept as a good planning option, however he

explained that enhancements such as additional recreation facilities and their appropriate locations would be the focus of second year studies. Study Plan R15 would provide baseline information on site suitability for long-term recreation planning.

Study Plan 16 (Whitewater and River Boating)

This study plan recognizes that only certain locations within the study area are suitable for whitewater activities and only during certain times of the year. The study has been modified to expand the study area, including more downstream area. Surveys will be conducted on various reaches of the river.

Study Plan 17 (Recreation Needs Analysis)

This study plan was revised to address Issue Statement S3; Issue Statement S2 was removed from consideration in this study. This study will evaluate both positive and negative effects from Project activities. This study is characterized as a roll-up of the other recreation studies.

Study Plan 18 (Recreation Activity, Spending, and Associated Economic Impacts)

Study Plan 19 (Fiscal Impacts)

These studies were described together by Tom Wegge with the consulting team. The impetus for these studies comes from Issue Statement S1 and S3. One product of these studies will be spreadsheet models that will be analytical tools available for future use. The geographic scope of these studies has been revised to include the greater Oroville area, the Gridley-Biggs area, and the City of Chico. A participant asked if there would be individual models for the Gridley-Biggs area. Tom Wegge responded that there would not be individual models for this area; instead, they will be evaluated in a community model framework.

The Facilitator reiterated that the purpose of these studies is to develop analytical tools to analyze future project impacts, such as from proposed management actions.

Next Meetings

Meeting scheduling was discussed including the challenge of balancing FERC's request to cluster meeting dates/times and various state and federal agency staff commitments to other projects.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Study Plan Task Force will review changes made to the study plans by the consultant team. The priority will be previous edits not included in the current version of the study plans and updates to critical path studies. These changes will be made by January 10, 2002, one week in advance to the following Task Force meeting date/time:

Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2002
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM
Location: Dangermond Associates office in Sacramento (directions to be provided)

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed on the following meeting date/time:

Date: Wednesday, January 30, 2002
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM
Location: To be determined

Several of the participants expressed concern regarding notification of future meeting dates/times. The Facilitator reminded participants that both Task Force and Work Group meetings are listed on the Oroville relicensing website and individual Task Force members on the distribution list are always notified for Task Force meetings. There was a request to notify participants that do not have Internet access by phone. The Facilitator indicated that she would try to notify by phone or fax those people needing such a service.

Agreements Made

1. A consensus was reached to present the 19 Recreation and Socioeconomics draft Study Plans to the Plenary Group on December 11, 2001 with verbal and written explanations regarding their review status.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R38: Present DWR recreation budget for Oroville at the Plenary Group meeting on December 11, 2001. Subsequently, present recreation budget to the Recreation and Socioeconomic Work Group on January 30, 2001.

Responsible: DWR Staff/Dave Ferguson

Due Date: December 11, 2001 / January 30, 2002

Action Item #R39: Double check that all approximately 150 recreation issues from the Scoping Document are tracked as to their fate.

Responsible: Consultant team / DWR Staff

Due Date: December 11, 2001

Action Item #R40: Confirm meeting summary postings.

Responsible: DWR Staff

Due Date: January 30, 2002